REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 7-10 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 5 and 7-10 stand objected to because their respective recited elements or steps were identified with numerical delineations and the examiner suggested they be changed to alphabetical delineations. Accordingly, these claims have been amended in accordance with the examiner's suggestion.

II. 35 USC § 102 CLAIM REJECTION

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,157,945 to Balma et al. (the Balma patent).

It is respectfully submitted that each of the independent claims of the subject application (namely, 1, 5 and 7-10) include the recitation of including a database containing a "corporation's preference" in addition "recipient's delivery preference". Further, claims 7 and 10 contain recitations concerning "setting priority of conflicting corporate and recipient preference" (see claim 7). The advantage of providing a "corporate preference" is that an administrator of the system may provide corporate rules for forwarding messages, which corporate rules may override a "recipient's delivery preference." For example, a "corporate preference" may temporarily ban e-mail due to virus concerns or facsimile messages due to security concerns.

With respect to the messaging system of the Balma patent, only user defined delivery preferences are taught. There are no teachings for providing a "corporate [delivery] preference". In making the rejection, the examiner does make reference to col.8, line 9 to col. 9, line 11 of the Balma patent for allegedly disclosing a "corporate preference". However, inspection of this reference indicates it only discloses prescribing user delivery preference data, whether it be directly prescribed by a user or defined by a

1

 $\{10024517.1\ \} \frac{\{10024173.1\ \}}{}$

user's travel itinerary. Thus, the Balma patent provides no teaching regarding a "corporate [delivery] preference" as recited in the claims of the subject application.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, 5 and 7-10, along with their respective depending claims (2-4 and 6), overcome the subject 35 USC §102(b) rejection and removal thereof is requested.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-10 are now in a condition for allowance and favorable action thereon is requested. If the Examiner should have any questions, he is kindly urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Capelli Reg. No. 38,405

Attorney for Applicants

Telephone (203) 924-3849